

**REMARKS**

**Interview Summary**

Applicants' representative would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of extending a telephonic interview on November 15, 2007. During the interview, a proposed amendment, similar to that in the present response, was discussed in light of the prior art. The examiner indicated that the amendment requires further search or consideration. Thus, no agreement has been reached regarding the patentability of the claim.

**Specification**

In the Office Action of July 16, 2007, the Examiner stated that:

The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to an unpublished U.S. application, foreign application or patent, or to a publication in improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference, if the material is relied upon to overcome any objection, rejection, or other requirement imposed by the Office. The amendment must be accompanied by a statement executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the material being inserted is the material previously incorporated by reference and that the amendment contains no new matter. 37 CFR 1.57(f).

Applicants respectfully submit that the present specification fully supports the claims, and no material incorporated by reference has been relied upon to overcome any objection or rejection. If the Examiner still believes that any material incorporated by reference was relied upon, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to specify such material more particularly.

The Examiner also stated that:

Applicant did not make reference to foreign application 35688/1999 in its specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that priority to Korean patent application 35688/1999 has been properly claimed and a copy of the priority document has been filed at the filing of the present application. Applicants are not aware of any requirement of identifying foreign priority documents in the specification.

### **Claims**

Claims 30-49 and 54-57 were pending when last examined. With this Response, Applicants' have amended claims 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, 46, 49 and 54-57. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in FIGS. 1-4 and in the corresponding description in the specification. For example, FIG. 1 shows an implementation of the claimed segment information, which is further explained in pages 6 and 7.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

Claims 30-49, and 54-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No 2007/0157225 by Harada et al. ("Harada"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 30, as amended, recites an apparatus for processing multimedia data. The apparatus includes a memory and a processor configured to perform operations that include receiving segment information about an audio-visual program. The segment information identifies audio-visual segments in the audio-visual program, wherein each audio-visual segment is defined by a temporal position in a multimedia stream of the audio-visual program and represents a continuous temporal content portion in the audio-visual program. The processor is also configured to perform operations that include generating a hierarchical data structure configured to facilitate browsing content in the audio-visual program. The hierarchical data structure includes the segment information along with segment group information defining first and second segment groups. Each of the first and second segment groups defines a respective set of audio-visual segments selected from the audio-visual

segments identified by the segment information in the multimedia stream of the audio-visual program, wherein the segment group information specifies a respective group type and a respective duration for each of said first and second segment groups. The respective group types indicate that the first and second segment groups represent respective first and second content summaries related to objects or events as depicted in the audio-visual program. The segment group information also includes segment order information defining that (i) the audio-visual segments within the first segment group are ordered relative to each other according to a time sequence that is significant for the first content summary's representation of the corresponding events or objects in the audio-visual program and (ii) the audio-visual segments within the second segment group are not ordered relative to each other according to any time sequence that is significant for the second content summary's representation of the corresponding events or objects in the audio-visual program. The processor is also configured to perform operations that include storing the hierarchical data structure including the segment information along with the segment group information in the memory.

Harada discloses receiving and displaying coupon information based on user profiles, but lacks several limitations of the claim. For example, Harada fails to disclose the claimed segment information and segment group information defining first and second segment groups, wherein respective group types indicate that the first and second segment groups represent respective first and second content summaries related to objects or events as depicted in the audio-visual program, and wherein segment order information defines that (i) the audio-visual segments within the first segment group are ordered relative to each other according to a time sequence that is significant for the first content summary's representation of the corresponding events or objects in the audio-visual program and (ii) the audio-visual segments within the second segment group are not ordered relative to each other according to any time sequence that is significant for the second content summary's representation of the corresponding events or objects in the audio-visual program. Because Harada fails to disclose at least these limitations, claim 30 is allowable. Claims 31-33 and 54-57 depend from claim 30 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 34, 38, 42, and 46 require, in part, limitations that are similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 30. Because Harada fails to disclose at least these limitations, claims 34, 38, 42, and 46 are allowable. Claims 35-37, 39-41, 43-45 and 47-49 are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants' respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7493.

No additional fees are required for this amendment. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1597.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

11/16/07  
Date

Richard A. Pask  
Signature

November 16, 2007

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715  
(415) 772-1200

Respectfully submitted,



By:

Ferenc Pazmandi  
Agent of Record  
Limited Recognition No. L0078  
FP/rp